arXiv:1701.04921v1 [math.ST] 18 Jan 2017

Divergence from, and Convergence to, Uniformity of Probability Density Quantiles

Robert G. Staudte*

La Trobe University

Aihua Xia†

University of Melbourne

18 January, 2017

Abstract

The probability density quantile (pdQ) carries essential information regarding shape and tail behavior of a location-scale family. The Kullback-Leibler divergences from uniformity of these pdQs are found and interpreted and convergence of the pdQ mapping to the uniform distribution is investigated.

Keywords: Hellinger distance; Kullback-Leibler divergence; relative entropy

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and summary

For each location-scale family of distributions with square-integrable density there is a probability density quantile (pdQ) which is an absolutely continuous distribution on the unit interval. Members of the class of such pdQs differ only in *shape*, and the asymmetry of their shapes can be partially ordered by their Hellinger distance or Kullback-Leibler divergences from the class of symmetric distributions on this interval. In addition, the tail behaviour of the original

*Corresponding author. Postal address: Department of Mathematics and Statistics, La Trobe University, VIC 3086, Australia. Email address: r.staudte@latrobe.edu.au.

†Postal address: School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, Australia. Email address: aihuaxia@unimelb.edu.au. Research supported by ARC Discovery Grant DP150101459.

family can be described in terms of the boundary derivatives of its pdQ . Empirical estimators of the pdQ s enable one to carry out inference, such as fitting shape parameter families to data. For numerous examples and other results, see Staudte (2016).

The Kullback-Leibler directed divergence and symmetrized divergence (KLD) of a pdQ with respect to the uniform distribution on [0,1] is investigated in Section 2, with remarkably simple numerical results. A Kullback-Leibler divergence map of standard continuous location-scale families is constructed. The 'shapeless' uniform distribution is the center of the pdQ universe, as is explained in Section 3, where we investigate the convergence of repeated applications of the pdQ transformation. A summary and discussion is found in Section 4.

1.2 Definitions

Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the class of cdf s F on the real line and for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$ define the associated *quantile function* of F by $Q(u) = \inf\{x : F(x) \geq u\}$, for $0 < u < 1$. When the random variable X has cdf F, we write $X \sim F$. When the density function $f = F'$ exists, we also write $X \sim f$ or $f \sim F$. We only discuss F absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, but the results can be extended to the discrete and mixture cases using other dominating measures.

Definition 1 *Let $\mathcal{F}' = \{F \in \mathcal{F} : f = F' \text{ exists}\}$. For each $F \in \mathcal{F}'$ we follow Parzen (1979) and define the* quantile density *function $q(u) = Q'(u) = 1/f(Q(u))$. Its reciprocal $fQ(u) = f(Q(u))$ is the* density quantile *function of Parzen (1979). For $F \in \mathcal{F}'$, and U uniformly distributed on [0,1], assume $\kappa = E[fQ(U)] = \int f^2(x)\,dx$ is finite; that is, f is square integrable. Then we can define the* continuous probability density quantile *(pdQ) of F by $f^*(u) = fQ(u)/\kappa$, $0 < u < 1$. Let $\mathcal{F}'^* \subset \mathcal{F}'$ denote the class of all such F.*

Not all f are square-integrable, and this requirement for the mapping $f \to f^*$ means that $\mathcal{F}'^*$ is a proper subset of $\mathcal{F}'$. The advantages of working with f^*s over fs are that they do not depend on location and scale parameters, they ignore flat spots in F and have a common bounded support [0,1]. Moreover, f^* often has a simpler formula than f; some examples are in Table 1.

Given densities f_1, f_2 with respect to Lebesgue measure, the *Hellinger distance* between them is defined by $H(f_1, f_2) = [2^{-1} \int \{\sqrt{f_1(x)} - \sqrt{f_2(x)}\}^2\,dx]^{1/2}$.

The *Kullback-Leibler information* $I(f_1 : f_2)$ in $X \sim f_1$ for discrimination between f_1 and f_2 is defined by (Kullback, 1968, p. 5) as $I(f_1 : f_2) = \int \ln(f_1(x)/f_2(x))\ f_1(x)\,dx$. (Kullback, 1968, Th. 3.2) show that $I(f_1 : f_2) \geq 0$ with equality if and only if $f_1 = f_2$ almost surely (a.s.).

Table 1: **Quantiles of some continuous distributions, their pdQ s and divergences from uniformity.** *In general, we denote* $x_u = Q(u) = F^{-1}(u)$*, but for the normal* $F = \Phi$ *with density* φ*, we use* $z_u = \Phi^{-1}(u)$*. The entries are given in terms of Euler's constant* $\gamma \approx 0.5772157$ *and* $\ln(2) \approx 0.6931472$*.*

	$Q(u)$	$f^*(u)$	$I^*(\mathcal{U} : f)$	$J^*(\mathcal{U}, f)$
Normal	z_u	$2\sqrt{\pi}\,\varphi(z_u)$	$(1 - \ln(2))/2$	$1/4$
Logistic	$\ln(u/(1-u))$	$6u(1-u)$	$2 - 3\ln(2)$	$1/3$
Laplace	$\ln(2u),\ u \le 0.5$ $-\ln(2(1-u)),\ u \ge 0.5$	$2\min\{u, 1-u\}$	$1 - \ln(2)$	$1/2$
Exponential	$-\ln(1-u)$	$2(1-u)$	$1 - \ln(2)$	$1/2$
Lognormal	e^{z_u}	$\frac{2\sqrt{\pi}}{e^{1/4}}\,\varphi(z_u)\,e^{-z_u}$	$(\frac{3}{2} - \ln(2))/2$	$5/8$
Gumbel	$-\ln(-\ln(u))$	$-4u\ln(u)$	$1 + \gamma - 2\ln(2)$	$1 - \ln(2)$
Cauchy	$\tan\{\pi(u - 0.5)\}$	$2\sin^2(\pi u)$	$\ln(2)$	1
Pareto(a)	$(1-u)^{-1/a}$	$(2 + \frac{1}{a})\,(1-u)^{1+1/a}$	$\frac{1+a}{a} - \ln(2 + \frac{1}{a})$	$\frac{(1+a)^2}{a(1+2a)}$
Power(b)	$u^{1/b}$	$(2 - \frac{1}{b})\,u^{1-1/b}$	$1 - \frac{1}{b} - \ln(2 - \frac{1}{b})$	$\frac{(b-1)^2}{b(2b-1)}$

The Kullback-Leibler *symmetrized divergence*, or KLD , is defined by $J(f_1, f_2) = I(f_1 : f_2) + I(f_2 : f_1)$. We often abbreviate $H(f_1, f_2)$ to $H(1,2)$, $I(f_1 : f_2)$ to $I(1:2)$ and $J(f_1, f_2)$ to $J(1,2)$. Further, we denote by $H^*(1,2)$ the Hellinger metric applied to the pdQ s f_1^*, f_2^* of f_1, f_2, and similarly for $I^*(1:2), I^*(2:1)$ and $J^*(1,2)$.

2 Divergence from uniformity

How far is an arbitrary pdQ f^* from uniformity? Let U denote a random variable with the uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}$ on [0,1].

2.1 Kullback-Leibler divergences

First we evaluate and plot the Kullback-Leibler divergences from uniformity. These distances are easily computed, for denoting $f^*(u) = (fQ)(u)/\kappa$ one can write

$$\begin{aligned} I^*(\mathcal{U} : f) &= -\int_0^1 \ln(f^*(u))\, du = \mathrm{E}[-\ln(f^*(U))] \\ I^*(f : \mathcal{U}) &= \int_0^1 \ln(f^*(u))\, f^*(u)\, du = \mathrm{E}[\ln(f^*(U))\, f^*(U)] \ . \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

According to (Kullback, 1968, p. 6) $I^*(\mathcal{U} : f)$ is the mean evidence in one observation $U \sim \mathcal{U}$ for uniformity over f^*. Similarly $I^*(f : \mathcal{U})$ is the mean evidence in one observation $V \sim f^*$ for f^* over $\mathcal{U}$; it is also called the *relative entropy* of f^* with respect to $\mathcal{U}$. In Table 1 are shown the quantile functions of some standard distributions representing location-scale families, together with their pdQs and associated values $I^*(\mathcal{U} : f)$ and the Kullback-Leibler symmetrized divergencs $J^*(\mathcal{U}, f)$.

2.2 Sample calculations for several examples

Unless otherwise specified in the sequel, all distributions are standard and found in Johnson *et al.* (1994), Johnson *et al.* (1995).

Extreme Value:

Consider Gumbel's distribution (extreme value of the first kind) which has cdf $F(x) = \exp(-e^{-x})$ for all x. It has $f^*(u) = -4u\ln(u)$ and $I^*(\mathcal{U} : f) = \int_0^1 \ln(u\ln(u))\, du - \ln(4) = \gamma + 1 - \ln(4) \approx 0.190121$, where γ is Euler's constant. Similarly $I^*(f : \mathcal{U}) = \ln(2) - \gamma$, so $J^*(\mathcal{U}, f) = 1 - \ln(2)$.

Student's t with 2 degrees of freeom:

Jones (2002) shows that starting with the density $f(x) = \{2 + x^2\}^{-3/2}$, the cdf $F(x) = \{(1 + x/(2 + x^2)^{1/2}\}/2$, the quantile function is $Q(u) = (2u-1)\{2u(1-u)\}^{-1/2}$ and density quantile function $fQ(u) = \{2u(1-u)\}^{3/2}$. The normalizing constant is $\kappa = 3\pi/(32\sqrt{2}\,) \approx 0.208620$. Then $I^*(\mathcal{U} : f) = 3 - \ln(128/(3\pi)) \approx 0.391312$. Also, $I^*(f : \mathcal{U}) \approx 0.199805$, so $J^*(\mathcal{U}, f) \approx 0.5911188$.

Pareto distributions:

For the Type I Pareto(a) distribution with $a > 0$, $f_a(x) = ax^{-a-1}$ for $x > 1$, so $Q_a(u) = (1-u)^{-1/a}$ and $f_a^*(u) = (2 + \frac{1}{a})\,(1-u)^{1+1/a}$. It follows that $I^*(\mathcal{U} : f_a) = 1 + 1/a - \ln(2 + 1/a)$, $I^*(f_a : \mathcal{U}) = \ln(2 + 1/a) - (1 + a)/(1 + 2a)$ and $J^*(\mathcal{U}, f_a) = (1 + a)^2/\{a(1 + 2a)\}$. These

divergences decrease from $+\infty$ for $a > 0$ and $J^*(\mathcal{U}, f_a) \to 1/2$ as $a \to \infty$. The Type II Pareto distributions have the same f_a^* because they are only a shift of Type I.

Power distributions:

The Power(b) distribution (also called Beta(b,1)) with $b > 0$ has density $f_b(x) = bx^{b-1}$ for $0 < x < 1$ so for $b > 1/2$ it has pdQ $f_b^*(u) = (2 - \frac{1}{b})\, u^{1-1/b}$. By calculations similar to those for the Pareto, one finds $J^*(\mathcal{U}, f_b) = (1-b)^2/\{b(2b-1)\}$. This quantity descends from $+\infty$ to 0 as b increases from 1/2 to 1 and then increases from 0 to 1/2 as b increases from 1 to $+\infty$.

Definition 2 *Given f_1, f_2 with pdQ s f_1^*, f_2^*, the square root of the KLD is*

$$d^*(f_1, f_2) = \sqrt{J^*(1,2)} = \sqrt{I^*(1:2) + I^*(2:1)}\ .$$

This d^* is not a metric on the space of distributions with pdQ s because it does not satisfy the triangle inequality: for example, if $\mathcal{U}$, $\mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ denote the uniform, normal and Cauchy location-scale families, then $d^*(\mathcal{U},\mathcal{N}) = 0.5$, $d^*(\mathcal{N},\mathcal{C}) = 0.4681$ but $d^*(\mathcal{U},\mathcal{C}) = 1$. However, d^* can provide an informative measure of distance from uniformity. Introducing the coordinates $(s_1, s_2) = (\sqrt{I^*(\mathcal{U}:f)}\,, \sqrt{I^*(f:\mathcal{U})}\,)$, we can define the distance from uniformity *of any f with associated pdQ f^* by the Euclidean distance of (s_1, s_2) from the origin $(0,0)$, namely $d^*(\mathcal{U}, f)$.*

The larger the value of $d^*(\mathcal{U}, f)$, the easier it is to discriminate between the uniform and f^*. In Figure 1 are shown the loci of points (s_1, s_2) for some continuous shape families. The light dotted arcs with radii 1/2, 1 and 2 are a guide to the d^*-distances from uniformity. The large discs in purple, red and black correspond to $\mathcal{U}$, $\mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{C}$. The blue cross at distance $\sqrt{2}/2$ from the origin corresponds to the exponential distribution. Nearby is the lognormal point marked by a red cross.

The Chi-squared(ν), $\nu > 1$, family appears as a red curve; it passes through the blue cross when $\nu = 2$, as expected, and heads toward the normal disc as $\nu \to \infty$. The Gamma family has the same locus of points as the Chi-squared family. The curve for the Weibull(β) family, for $0.5 < \beta < 3$ is shown in blue; it crosses the exponential blue cross when $\beta = 1$. The Pareto(a) curve is shown in black. As a increases from 0, this black line crosses the arcs distant 2 and 1 from the origin for $a = (2\sqrt{2} + 1)/7 \approx 0.547$ and $a = (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2 \approx 1.618$, respectively, and approaches the exponential blue cross as $a \to \infty$.

The Power(b) or Beta($b, 1$) for $b > 1/2$ family is represented by the top magenta curve of points moving toward the origin as b increases from 1/2 to 1, and then moving out towards the exponential blue cross as $b \to \infty$. The lower green line near the Pareto black curve gives



Figure 1: **Divergence from uniformity.** *The loci of points* $(s_1, s_2) = (\sqrt{I^*(\mathcal{U}:f)}, \sqrt{I^*(f:\mathcal{U})})$ *defined in (1) is shown for various standard families. The large disks correspond respectively to the symmetric families: uniform (purple), normal (red) and Cauchy (black). The crosses correspond to the asymmetric distributions: exponential (blue) and lognormal (red). The solid red curve is the locus of points defined by the Chi-squared family with degrees of freedom* $\nu > 1$*; the points on this curve proceed towards the normal red disc as* $\nu \to \infty$*. The solid green curves emanating from the origin are the points corresponding to the Tukey(*λ*) family; the lower line is for* $\lambda < 1$*; the upper for* $\lambda \geq 1$*. The solid black curve is the locus of points defined by the Pareto family with shape parameter* $a > 0$*; it approaches the exponential (blue cross) as* $a \to \infty$*. More details are given in Section 2.1.*

the loci of root-divergences from uniformity of the Tukey(λ) with $\lambda < 1$, while the upper green curve corresponds to $\lambda \geq 1$.

It is known that the Tukey(λ) distributions, with $\lambda < 1/7$, are good approximations to Student's t distributions for $\nu > 0$ provided λ is chosen properly. The same is true for their corresponding pdQ s. It is shown in Example 3 of (Staudte, 2016, Sec.3.2) that for $\nu \geq 12$ a good choice is $\lambda = 0.14435 - 1/(1.07\,\nu)$. For small $0 < \nu \leq 1$ a rough guide is $\lambda = -1/\nu$. As an example, the pdQ of t with $\nu = 0.24$ degrees of freedom is well approximated by the choice $\lambda = -4.063$. The pdQ of this Tukey distribution has divergences from uniformity marked by the small black disk in Figure 1; it is distant 2 from the origin.

For each choice of $\alpha > 0.5$, $\beta > 0.5$ the locus of the Beta(α, β) pdQ divergences lies above the chi-squared red curve and mostly below the power(b) magenta curve; however, the U-shaped Beta distributions have loci slightly above the magenta curve.

The generalized Tukey distributions described by Freimer *et al.* (1988) with two shape parameters also fill a large funnel shaped region (not marked on the map) emanating from the origin and just including the region bounded by the green curves of the Tukey symmetric distributons.

3 Convergence to uniformity

3.1 Examples of convergence to uniformity

The transformation $f \to f^*$ of Definition 1 is quite powerful, removing location and scale and moving the distribution from the support of f to the unit interval. Examples suggest that another application of the transformation $f^{2*} := (f^*)^*$ leaves less information about f in f^{2*} and hence it is closer to the uniform density. Further, with n iterations $f^{(n+1)*} := (f^{n*})^*$ for $n \geq 2$, we would expect that f^{n*} converges to the uniform density as $n \to \infty$. An R script Team (2008) for finding repeated $*$-iterates of a given pdQ is available as Supplementary Online Material.

Example 1: Power function family.

From Table 1 the Power(b) family has density $f_b(x) = bx^{b-1}$, $0 < x < 1$, quantile function $Q_b(u) = u^{1/b}$ and, if $b > 1/2$, so that $b^* = (2b-1)/b > 0$, the pdQ $f_b^*(u) = b^* u^{b^*-1}$. This f_b^* has $F_b^*(u) = u^{b^*}$ and quantile function $Q_b^*(u) = u^{1/b^*}$. Hence, for $b > 2/3$, and $b^{2*} = (3b-2)/(2b-1) > 0$, the pdQ f_b^{2*} exists. It is given by $f_b^{2*}(u) = b^{2*} u^{b^{2*}-1}$. In general, f_b^{n*} exists and is in the Power(b) family only if $b > n/(n+1)$ and then $b^{n*} = \{(n+1)b - n\}/(nb - n + 1)$. Therefore for any $b < 1$ the sequence $\{f_b^{n*}\}$ is finite, while for $b = 1$ all elements are uniform, and for $b > 1$ we have $b^{n*} \to 1$ so the elements f_b^{n*} converge to the uniform.

Definition 3 *Recall that $H(f, g)$ denotes the Hellinger distance of f from g. Given any sequence $\{f^{n*}\}$ of successive pdQ s generated by a pdQ f^* and successive *-maps, define $H(n, n+1) = H(f^{n*}, f^{(n+1)*})$ and $H(n) = H(f^{n*}, \mathcal{U})$, for $n = 1, 2, \ldots$. Similarly for the L_1 distance on the unit interval $\|g_1 - g_2\|_1 = \int_0^1 |g_1(u) - g_2(u)|\, du$, introduce $L(n, n+1) = \|f^{n*} - f^{(n+1)*}\|_1$ and $L(n) = \|f^{n*} - \mathcal{U}\|_1$.*



Figure 2: **Power density f_b^{n*} convergence, where $b = 5$:** *The upper left plot shows $H(n, n+1)$ of Definition 3 in solid lines and $L(n, n+1)$ in dashed lines, plotted as functions of n. The upper right plot shows the corresponding ratios $r_H(n) = H(n+1, n+2)/H(n, n+1)$ of Hellinger distances of adjacent members of the sequence as a function of n; they are the same as for the L_1 distance ratios. In the lower left plot are shown the Hellinger distances $H(n)$ of f_b^{n*} from the uniform distribution, again as a solid line, together with the L_1 distances $L(n)$ as dashed line. The dotted line is a plot of the asymptotic approximation for $L(n)$ found in (3). The bottom right plot depicts the ratio of successive distances from the uniform as n increases; note that the ratios again agree for Hellinger and L_1 metrics. Finally, the dotted line shows the asymptotic expression for these distances (4).*

Usually we resort to numerical integration to determine $H(n, n+1)$, $H(n)$, $L(n, n+1)$ and $L(n)$, but in some cases it is possible to find exact expressions for them. For example, to find the L_1-distance of $\{f_b^{n*}\}$ to $\mathcal{U}$, define $a = b^{1/(1-b)}$ and evaluate

$$\begin{aligned} L_b(1) &= \int_0^1 |f_b(u) - 1|\, du = \int_0^a (1 - f_b(u))\, du + \int_a^1 (f_b(u) - 1)\, du \\ &= 2a(1 - a^{b-1}) = 2\left(1 - \frac{1}{b}\right) b^{1/(1-b)} \,. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Therefore, writing $b^{n*} = 1 + \{n + c\}^{-1}$, where $c = (b-1)^{-1}$,

$$L_b(n) = 2\,\frac{1}{n+c+1}\,\left(1 + \frac{1}{n+c}\right)^{-(n+c)} \sim \frac{2}{e\{n + b/(b-1)\}} \,. \tag{3}$$

Further

$$L_b(n+1)/L_b(n) \sim \frac{\{n + b/(b-1)\}}{\{n + 1 + b/(b-1)\}} \sim 1 - \frac{e\, L_b(n+1)}{2} \,. \tag{4}$$

As an example, fix the sequence $\{f_b^{n*}\}$ for $b = 5$. Figure 2 contains plots showing (in solid lines, top left) the successive Hellinger distances $H(n, n+1)$; top right, the ratios $r_H(n) = H(n+1, n+2)/H(n+1, n)$; bottom left, the distances from uniformity $H(n)$; and bottom

right, the ratios of such distances $H(n+1)/H(n)$. Superimposed in dashed lines are the corresponding values and ratios for the L_1 metric. Remarkably the ratios are same for these two metrics.

Remark: A consequence of this example is that convergence to uniformity is order $1/n$ *for each metric, and further with* $H(n+1)/H(n) = L(n+1)/L(n) \uparrow 1$. *It is worth noting that the ratios of distances of successive members also approaches one, precluding either metric leading to a contraction map on the Banach space* $L_1[0,1]$ *of Lebesgue integrable functions on [0,1].*

Example 2: Exponential distribution.

Suppose $f(x) = e^x, \quad x < 0$. Then $f^*(u) = 2u$, $0 < u < 1$, which belongs to the Power(2) distribution; and so by Example 1, f^{n*} converges to the uniform distribution as $n \to \infty$. By symmetry, the same result holds for $f(x) = e^{-x}, \quad x > 0$.

Example 3: Pareto distribution.

The Pareto(a) family, with $a > 0$, has $f_a^*(u) = (2 + \frac{1}{a})(1-u)^{1+1/a}$. Therefore $F_a^*(u) = (1-u)^{2+1/a}$, $Q_a^*(u) = 1 - u^{a/(1+2a)}$ and $f_a^{2*}(u) = \frac{(2+3a)}{(1+2a)}\, u^{(1+a)/(1+2a)}$, which is in the Power($b$) family, with $b = \frac{(2+3a)}{(1+2a)} > 1$ for all $a > 0$, so by Example 1, the sequence $\{f_a^{n*}\}_{n\geq 1}$ exists and converges to the uniform distribution as $n \to \infty$.

Example 4: Cauchy distribution.

The pdQ of the Cauchy density is given by $f^*(u) = 2\sin^2(\pi u)$, $0 < u < 1$, see Table 1; it retains the bell shape of f as shown in Figure 1. It follows that $F^*(t) = t - \sin(2\pi t)/(2\pi)$, for $0 < t < 1$. To obtain f^{2*}, one needs to solve numerically for Q^*, numerically compute $\kappa^* = \int_0^1 (f^*Q^*)(u)\, du$ and then $f^{2*}(u) = (f^*Q^*)(u)/\kappa^*$. A plot of f^{2*} (not shown) reveals its shape is close to that of φ^*, the pdQ of the normal. Thus two iterations of the $*$-operation are required to remove the bell-shape of the original Cauchy, and bring it closer to that of the single operation on φ.

Example 5: Normal distribution.

The pdQ of the normal density is $\varphi^*(u) = 2\sqrt{\pi}\,\varphi(z_u)$, where $z_u = \Phi^{-1}(u)$. Thus its distribution function is

$$\Phi^*(u) = 2\sqrt{\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{z_u} \varphi^2(x)\, dx = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{z_u} e^{-x^2}\, dx = \int_{-\infty}^{z_u} \sqrt{2}\,\varphi(\sqrt{2}\,x)\, dx = \Phi(\sqrt{2}\,z_u)\ .$$

The quantile function $Q^*(t) = (\Phi^*)^{-1}(t)$ is the solution z_t^* to $t = \Phi\big(\sqrt{2}\,\Phi^{-1}(z_t^*)\big)$; it is $z_t^* = Q^*(t) = \Phi(z_t/\sqrt{2}\,)$. Hence the density quantile function of φ^* is $\varphi^*(Q^*(u)) = 2\sqrt{\pi}\,\varphi(z_u/\sqrt{2}\,)$, $\kappa^* = 2\sqrt{\pi}\,\int_0^1 \varphi(z_u/\sqrt{2}\,)\,du = 2/\sqrt{3}$, and $\varphi^{2*}(u) = \sqrt{3\pi}\,\varphi(z_u/\sqrt{2}\,)$. Continuing, one can show by induction that $\varphi^{n*}(u) = \sqrt{1+1/n}\,\sqrt{2\pi}\,\varphi(z_u/\sqrt{n}\,)$. Therefore, for any $0 < u < 1$, we have $\varphi^{n*}(u) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. An analysis and plots (not shown) of the rates of convergence of $\{\varphi^{n*}\}$ like those in Figure 2 for $\{f_5^{n*}\}$ was carried out with similar results, although we did not attempt to find asymptotic expression such as (3) and (4). These examples suggest to us that for bounded densities, repeated application of the *-transformation will lead to uniformity. Even weaker conditions may suffice.

3.2 Conditions for convergence to uniformity

Definition 4 *Given $f \in \mathcal{F}'$, we say that f is of* $*$-order n *if $f^*, f^{2*}, \ldots, f^{n*}$ exist but $f^{(n+1)*}$ does not. When the infinite sequence $\{f^{n*}\}_{n\geq 1}$ exists, it is said to be of* infinite $*$-order.

For example, the Power(3/4) family is of $*$-order 2, while the Power(2) family is of infinite $*$-order. The χ^2_ν distribution is of finite $*$-order for $1 < \nu < 2$ and infinite $*$-order for $\nu \geq 2$. The normal distribution is of infinite $*$-order.

We write $\mu_n := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\{f(y)\}^n\,dy$, $\kappa_n = \int\{f^{n*}(x)\}^2\,dx$, $n \geq 1$, and $\kappa_0 = \int\{f(x)\}^2\,dx$. The next proposition characterises the property of infinite $*$-order.

Proposition 1 *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}'$, then $\kappa_n = \frac{\mu_n\mu_{n+2}}{\mu_{n+1}^2}$, $n \geq 1$. Moreover, f is of infinite $*$-order if and only if $\mu_n < \infty$, $n \geq 1$.*

Proof of Proposition 1: *For each $i, n \geq 1$, we have the following recursive formula*

$$\nu_{n+1,i} := \int\{f^{(n+1)*}(x)\}^i\,dx = \frac{1}{\kappa_n^i}\,\nu_{n,i+1}.$$

Hence

$$\nu_{n+1,i} = \frac{1}{\prod_{j=0}^n \kappa_j^{n+i-j}}\,\mu_{n+i+1},$$

which, with $i = 2$, implies

$$\mu_{n+3} = \nu_{n+1,2}\prod_{j=0}^{n}\kappa_j^{n+2-j} = \prod_{j=0}^{n+1}\kappa_j^{n+2-j}. \tag{5}$$

Now, $\kappa_n = \frac{\mu_n\mu_{n+2}}{\mu_{n+1}^2}$ follows from (5) immediately.

If $\mu_n < \infty$ for all $n \geq 1$, then $\kappa_n = \frac{\mu_n\mu_{n+2}}{\mu_{n+1}^2} < \infty$ for all $n \geq 1$, hence f is of infinite $*$-order. Conversely, when f is of infinite $*$-order, then (5) ensures that $\mu_n < \infty$ for all $n \geq 1$. □

Next we investigate the involutionary nature of the $*$-transformation.

Proposition 2 *Let f^* be a pdQ with quantile function Q^*, and assume f^{2*} exists. Then $f^* \sim \mathcal{U}$ if and only if $f^{2*} \sim \mathcal{U}$.*

Proof of Proposition 2: *We have*

$$\int_0^1 |f^{2*}(u) - 1|\, du = \frac{1}{\kappa_1} \int_0^1 |f^*(x) - \kappa_1| f^*(x)\, dx. \tag{6}$$

If $f^*(u) \sim \mathcal{U}$, then $\kappa_1 = 1$ and (6) ensures $\int_0^1 |f^{2*}(u) - 1| du = 0$, so $f^{2*}(u) \sim \mathcal{U}$.

Conversely, if $f^{2*}(u) \sim \mathcal{U}$, then using (6) again gives $\int_0^1 |f^*(x) - \kappa_1| f^*(x)\, dx = 0$. Since $f^*(x) > 0$ a.s., we have $f^*(x) = \kappa_1$ a.s. and this can only happen when $\kappa_1 = 1$. Thus $f^* \sim \mathcal{U}$, as required. □.

Proposition 2 shows that the uniform distribution is a fixed point in the Banach space of integrable functions on [0,1] with the L_1-norm. It remains to show f^{n*} has a limit and that the limit is the uniform distribution. It was hoped the classical machinery for convergence in Banach spaces (Luenberger, 1969, Ch.10) would prove useful in this regard, but the *-mapping is not a contraction, as shown by Example 1 of Section 3.1.

We write $\|g\| = \sup_x |g(x)|$ for each bounded function g.

Proposition 3 *For $f \in \mathcal{F}'$ with infinite $*$-order, f^{n*} converges in L_2 norm to 1 as $n \to \infty$ if and only if $\frac{\mu_n \mu_{n+2}}{\mu_{n+1}^2} \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. In particular, if f is bounded, then*

(i) for all $n \geq 0$, $\|f^{(n+1)*}\| \leq \|f^{n*}\|$ and the inequality becomes equality if and only if $f^{n*} \sim \mathcal{U}$;

(ii) f^{n*} converges in L_2 norm to 1 as $n \to \infty$.

Proof of Proposition 3: *By Proposition 1, $\kappa_n = \frac{\mu_n \mu_{n+2}}{\mu_{n+1}^2}$. Now*

$$\int_0^1 \{f^{n*}(x) - 1\}^2\, dx = \kappa_n - 1,$$

so the first claim follows immediately.

Now, we assume f is bounded. Clearly, $\kappa_n \geq 1$, where the inequality becomes equality if and only if $f^{n*} \sim \mathcal{U}$.

(i) Let Q^{n*} be the inverse of the cumulative distribution function of f^{n*}, then $f^{(n+1)*}(u) = \frac{f^{n*}(Q^{n*}(u))}{\kappa_n} \leq \frac{\|f^{n*}\|}{\kappa_n}$, giving $\|f^{(n+1)*}\| \leq \frac{\|f^{n*}\|}{\kappa_n}$. If $f^{n*} \sim \mathcal{U}$, then Proposition 2 ensures that $f^{(n+1)*} \sim \mathcal{U}$, so $\|f^{(n+1)*}\| = \|f^{n*}\|$. Conversely, if $\|f^{(n+1)*}\| = \|f^{n*}\|$, then $\kappa_n = 1$, so $f^{n*} \sim \mathcal{U}$.

(ii) It remains to show that $\kappa_n \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. In fact, if $\kappa_n \not\to 1$, since $\kappa_n \geq 1$, there exist a $\delta > 0$ and a subsequence $\{n_k\}$ such that $\kappa_{n_k} \geq 1 + \delta$, which implies

$$\frac{\mu_{n_k+2}}{\mu_{n_k+1}} = \prod_{i=0}^{n_k} \kappa_i \geq (1+\delta)^k \to \infty \text{ as } k \to \infty. \tag{7}$$

However, $\frac{\mu_{n_k+2}}{\mu_{n_k+1}} \leq \|f\| < \infty$, which contradicts (7). □

Example 6:

Let $f(x) = -\ln x$, $x \in (0,1)$, then $\mu_n = n!$ and $\kappa_n = \frac{n+2}{n+1} \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$, so f^{n*} converges in L_2 norm to constant 1 as $n \to \infty$.

4 Summary and Discussion

The pdQ transformation from a density function f to f^* extracts the important information of f such as its asymmetry and tail behaviour and ignores the less critical information such as gaps, location and scale and thus provides a powerful tool in studying the distributional shapes of density functions.

We found the directed and symmetrized divergences from uniformity of the pdQs of many standard location-scale families and used them to make a plot of the distance of each shape family from uniformity.

In terms of the limiting behaviour of repeated applications of the pdQ mapping, when the density function f is bounded, we showed that each application lowers its modal height and hence the resulting density function f^* is closer to the uniform density than f. Furthermore, we established a necessary and sufficient condition for f^{n*} converging in L_2 norm to the uniform density, giving a positive answer to a conjecture raised in Staudte (2016). In particular, if f is bounded, we proved that f^{n*} converges in L_2 norm to the uniform density. The proposition can be interpreted as follows. As we repeatedly apply the pdQ transformation, we keep losing information about the shape of the original f and will eventually exhaust the information, leaving nothing in the limit, as represented by the uniform density, which means no points carry more information than other points. Thus the pdQ transformation plays a similar role to the difference operator in time series analysis where repeated applications of the difference operator to a time series with polynomial component lead to a white noise with a constant power spectral density (Brockwell & Davis, 2009, p. 19).

We conjecture that every almost surely positive density g on $[0,1]$ is a pdQ of a density function, hence uniquely represents a location-scale family. This is equivalent to saying that there exists a density function f such that $g = f^*$. When g satisfies $\int_0^1 \frac{1}{g(t)} dt < \infty$, one can show that the cdf F of f can be uniquely (up to location-scale parameters) represented as $F(x) = H^{-1}(H(1)x)$, where $H(x) = \int_0^x \frac{1}{g(t)} dt$ (Professor A.D, Barbour, personal communication). The condition $\int_0^1 \frac{1}{g(t)} dt < \infty$ is equivalent to saying that f has bounded support and it is certainly not necessary, e.g., $g(x) = 2x$ for $x \in [0,1]$ and $f(x) = e^x$ for $x < 0$ (see Example 2 in Section 3.1).

Acknowledgments: The authors thank Professor P.J. Brockwell for helpful commentary on an earlier version of this manuscript. This research is supported by ARC Discovery Grant DP150101459.

References

Brockwell, P.J., & Davis, R.A. 2009. *Time Series: Theory and Methods*. Springer-Verlag.

Freimer, M., Mudholkar, G.S., Kollia, G., & Lin, C.T. 1988. A study of the generalized Tukey lambda family. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, **17**, 3547–3567.

Johnson, N.L., Kotz, S., & Balakrishnan, N. 1994. *Continuous univariate distributions*. Vol. 1. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Johnson, N.L., Kotz, S., & Balakrishnan, N. 1995. *Continuous univariate distributions*. Vol. 2. New York: John Wiley & Sons. ISBN 0-471-58494-0.

Jones, M.C. 2002. Student's simplest distribution. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society D (The Statistician)*, **51**(1), 41–49.

Kullback, S. 1968. *Information Theory and Statistics*. Mineola, NY: Dover.

Luenberger, D.G. 1969. *Optimization by Vector Space Methods*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Parzen, E. 1979. Nonparametric statistical data modeling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **7**, 105–131.

Staudte, R.G. 2016. The shapes of things to come: probability density quantiles. *Statistics: a Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*. DOI: 10.1080/02331888.2016.1277225.

Team, R Development Core. 2008. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0.